



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/814,714	03/23/2001	Satoshi Kamiya	017446/0310	4370
22428	7590	05/05/2005	EXAMINER	
FOLEY AND LARDNER SUITE 500 3000 K STREET NW WASHINGTON, DC 20007			RYMAN, DANIEL J	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2665	

DATE MAILED: 05/05/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/814,714

Applicant(s)

KAMIYA, SATOSHI

Examiner

Daniel J. Ryman

Art Unit

2665

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 23 March 2001.
- 2a) ☐ This action is FINAL. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-4 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-4 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) 4 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 23 March 2001 is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☒ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- 1) ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - 2) ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - 3) ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>1</u> . | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Drawings

1. Figures 9-13 should be designated by a legend such as --Prior Art-- because only that which is old is illustrated. See MPEP § 608.02(g). Corrected drawing sheets are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. The replacement sheet(s) should be labeled "Replacement Sheet" in the page header (as per 37 CFR 1.84(c)) so as not to obstruct any portion of the drawing figures. If the changes are not accepted by the examiner, the applicant will be notified and informed of any required corrective action in the next Office action. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.
2. The drawings are objected to because in Fig. 6 the processing sequence comprising IM1, IM2, IM3, and IM4 should be boxed for TS17, TS18, and TS19 in a fashion similar to that for the processing sequences for the other time slots. Corrected drawing sheets are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. Any amended replacement drawing sheet should include all of the figures appearing on the immediate prior version of the sheet, even if only one figure is being amended. The figure or figure number of an amended drawing should not be labeled as "amended." If a drawing figure is to be canceled, the appropriate figure must be removed from the replacement sheet, and where necessary, the remaining figures must be renumbered and appropriate changes made to the brief description of the several views of the drawings for consistency. Additional replacement sheets may be necessary to show the renumbering of the remaining figures. The replacement sheet(s) should be labeled "Replacement Sheet" in the page header (as per 37 CFR 1.84(c)) so as not to obstruct any portion of the drawing figures. If the changes are not accepted by the examiner, the applicant

Art Unit: 2665

will be notified and informed of any required corrective action in the next Office action. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

Specification

3. The disclosure is objected to because of the following informalities: on page 4, line 26 “10-1 to 0-4” should be “10-1 to 10-4”; on page 7, line 15 “umber” should be “number”; and on page 10, lines 12-14 the acronym LSI should be defined.

Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Objections

4. Claim 4 is objected to because of the following informalities: claim 4 states that each input module comprises output port reservation information receiving sections, allocators, and output port reservation information transmitting sections where the output port reservation information receiving sections, allocators, and output port reservation information transmitting sections simultaneously execute processing for different reservation time slots. It is unclear from this limitation if the output port reservation information receiving sections, allocators, and output port reservation information transmitting sections of each input module simultaneously execute processing for different reservation time slots within each input module or between the input modules. Since having each input module simultaneously execute processing for different reservation time slots is prior art as admitted by Applicant, Examiner will interpret “wherein said output port reservation information receiving sections, allocators, and output port reservation information transmitting sections simultaneously execute” to be “wherein said output port reservation information receiving sections, allocators, and output port reservation information

Art Unit: 2665

transmitting sections within each input module simultaneously execute” for prior art rejections.

Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

5. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

6. Claims 1-4 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Applicant's Admitted Prior Art (AAPA) in view of Chao et al. (USPN 5,724,351) in further view of Hanaki (USPN 6,269,439).

7. Regarding claim 1, Applicant admits as prior art a distributed pipeline scheduling method for a system which includes a plurality of input ports for inputting data (Fig. 8 and page 1, line 14-page 4, line 21), a plurality of output ports for outputting data (Fig. 8 and page 1, line 14-page 4, line 21), a data switch element for switching the data input from the input ports and transferring the data to the output ports (Fig. 8 and page 1, line 14-page 4, line 21), and a scheduler having a distributed scheduling architecture for controlling the data switch element (Figs. 8 and 9 and page 1, line 14-page 5, line 24), and determines connection reservations between the input ports and the output ports (Figs. 8 and 9 and page 1, line 14-page 5, line 24), comprising the steps of: causing the scheduler to assign time slots to information transfer processing and reservation processing (Figs. 8, 9, and 13; page 1, line 14-page 5, line 24; and page 8, line 17-page 10, line 14); and processing information transfer processing and reservation

Art Unit: 2665

processing in the assigned time slots (Figs. 8, 9, and 13; page 1, line 14-page 5, line 24; and page 8, line 17-page 10, line 14).

Applicant does not admit as prior art causing the scheduler to independently assign time slots to information transfer processing and reservation processing; and processing information transfer processing and reservation processing in the assigned time slots in a pipeline fashion. Rather Applicant admits as prior art that the scheduler assigns the same time slot to information transfer processing and reservation processing (Figs. 8, 9, and 13; page 1, line 14-page 5, line 24; and page 8, line 17-page 10, line 14). Chao teaches, in a packet switching system, that adequate performance of a large switch is only possible by using pipeline techniques in the scheduler (arbiter) (col. 6, lines 27-37); however, Chao does not specify how the pipeline processing is performed. Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to process information transfer processing and reservation processing in assigned time slots in a pipeline fashion in order to have adequate performance in a large switch.

Applicant in view of Chao does not expressly disclose that the scheduler independently assigns time slots to information transfer processing and reservation processing; however, Applicant in view of Chao does disclose performing pipeline processing in the scheduler (Chao: col. 6, lines 27-37) where the scheduler performs information transfer processing and reservation processing (AAPA: Figs. 8, 9, and 13; page 1, line 14-page 5, line 24; and page 8, line 17-page 10, line 14). Hanaki teaches, in a pipeline processing system, independently assigning time slots to different stages of the pipeline processor in order to increase the amount of processing that can be accomplished per unit time compared to a processor without pipeline processing (Fig. 2 and col. 1, lines 42-67). Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the

Art Unit: 2665

time of the invention to independently assign time slots to information transfer processing and reservation processing in order to increase the amount of processing that can be accomplished per unit time compared to a processor without pipeline processing.

8. Regarding claim 2, Applicant in view of Chao in further view of Hanaki discloses that the scheduler includes N (N is a natural number) distributed scheduling modules for performing information transfer processing and reservation processing in units of time slots (AAPA: Figs. 8 and 9 and page 1, line 14-page 5, line 24), and the step of processing comprises the step of determining a connection reservation, by using the distributed scheduling module, for a predetermined time slot at a time point after a lapse of a time corresponding to a number time slots from a time slot from which the reservation processing is started (AAPA: Figs. 8 and 9 and page 1, line 14-page 5, line 24; Chao: col. 6, lines 27-37; and Hanaki: Fig. 2 and col. 1, lines 42-67). Applicant in view of Chao in further view of Hanaki does not expressly disclose that the number of time slots is $2N-1$ time slots; however, Applicant in view of Chao in further view of Hanaki does disclose that there is a number of time slots between the start of the processing and the predetermined time slot which is being reserved (AAPA: Figs. 8 and 9 and page 1, line 14-page 5, line 24; Chao: col. 6, lines 27-37; and Hanaki: Fig. 2 and col. 1, lines 42-67). It is generally considered to be within the ordinary skill in the art to adjust, vary, select, or optimize the numerical parameters or values of any system absent a showing of criticality in a particular recited value. The burden of showing criticality is on applicant. In re Mason, 87 F.2d 370, 32 USPQ 242 (CCPA 1937); Marconi Wireless Telegraph Co. v. U.S., 320 U.S. 1, 57 USPQ 471 (1943); In re Schneider, 148 F.2d 108, 65 USPQ 129 (CCPA 1945); In re Aller, 220 F.2d 454, 105 USPQ 233 (CCPA 1055); In re Saether, 492 F.2d 849, 181 USPQ 36 (CCPA 1974); In re

Art Unit: 2665

Antonie, 559 F.2d 618, 195 USPQ 6 (CCPA 1977); In re Boesch, 617 F.2d 272, 205 USPQ 215 (CCPA 1980). Since Applicant in view of Chao in further view of Hanaki discloses that there is a number of time slots between the start of the processing and the predetermined time slot which is being reserved, it would have been obvious at the time of the invention to use any number of time slots, including 2N-1, absent a showing of criticality by Applicant.

9. Regarding claim 3, Applicant admits as prior art a distributed pipeline scheduling system comprising a plurality of input ports for inputting data (Fig. 8 and page 1, line 14-page 4, line 21), a plurality of output ports for outputting data (Fig. 8 and page 1, line 14-page 4, line 21), a data switch element for switching the data input from the input ports and transferring the data to the output ports (Fig. 8 and page 1, line 14-page 4, line 21), and a scheduler having a distributed scheduling architecture for controlling the data switch element (Figs. 8 and 9 and page 1, line 14-page 5, line 24), wherein said scheduler comprises a plurality of input modules for performing reservation processing for different time slots (Figs. 8, 9, and 13; page 1, line 14-page 10, line 14), and said input modules respectively comprise information transfer processing means and reservation processing means for performing information transfer and reservation processing for different time slots (Figs. 8, 9, and 13; page 1, line 14-page 10, line 14).

Applicant does not admit as prior art that the scheduler comprises a plurality of input modules for performing reservation processing for different time slots at the same time in a pipeline fashion, and the input modules respectively comprise information transfer processing means and reservation processing means for performing information transfer and reservation processing for different time slots at the same time in a pipeline fashion. Chao teaches, in a packet switching system, that adequate performance of a large switch is only possible by using

Art Unit: 2665

pipeline techniques in the scheduler (arbiter) (col. 6, lines 27-37); however, Chao does not specify how the pipeline processing is performed. Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have the scheduler comprise a plurality of input modules for performing reservation processing in a pipeline fashion and to have the input modules respectively comprise information transfer processing means and reservation processing means for performing information transfer and reservation processing in a pipeline fashion in order to have adequate performance in a large switch.

Applicant in view of Chao does not expressly disclose that that the scheduler comprises a plurality of input modules for performing reservation processing for different time slots at the same time, and said input modules respectively comprise information transfer processing means and reservation processing means for performing information transfer and reservation processing for different time slots at the same time; however, Applicant in view of Chao does disclose performing pipeline processing in the scheduler (Chao: col. 6, lines 27-37) where the scheduler performs information transfer processing and reservation processing (AAPA: Figs. 8, 9, and 13; page 1, line 14-page 5, line 24; and page 8, line 17-page 10, line 14). Hanaki teaches, in a pipeline processing system, independently assigning time slots to different stages of the pipeline processor in order to increase the amount of processing that can be accomplished per unit time compared to a processor without pipeline processing (Fig. 2 and col. 1, lines 42-67). Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have the scheduler comprise a plurality of input modules for performing reservation processing for different time slots at the same time in a pipeline fashion, and said input modules respectively comprise information transfer processing means and reservation processing means for

Art Unit: 2665

performing information transfer and reservation processing for different time slots at the same time in a pipeline fashion in order to increase the amount of processing that can be accomplished per unit time compared to a processor without pipeline processing.

10. Regarding claim 4, Applicant admits as prior art a distributed scheduler for distributed pipeline scheduling which is used by a packet switch in a packet switching system (Fig. 8 and page 1, line 14-page 4, line 21), comprising: a plurality of input modules respectively having output port reservation information receiving sections, allocators, and output port reservation information transmitting sections and serving to perform distributed scheduling (Figs. 8, 9, and 13 and page 1, line 14-page 10, line 14), wherein said output port reservation information receiving sections, allocators, and output port reservation information transmitting sections execute processing for different reservation time slots (Figs. 8, 9, and 13; page 1, line 14-page 5, line 24; and page 8, line 17-page 10, line 14).

Applicant does not admit as prior art that the output port reservation information receiving sections, allocators, and output port reservation information transmitting sections within each input module simultaneously execute processing for different reservation time slots. Chao teaches, in a packet switching system, that adequate performance of a large switch is only possible by using pipeline techniques in the scheduler (arbiter) (col. 6, lines 27-37); however, Chao does not specify how the pipeline processing is performed. Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to perform pipeline processing in each input module in order to have adequate performance in a large switch.

Applicant in view of Chao does not expressly disclose that the output port reservation information receiving sections, allocators, and output port reservation information transmitting

Art Unit: 2665

sections within each input module simultaneously execute processing for different reservation time slots. Hanaki teaches, in a pipeline processing system, simultaneously execute processing for different items in the elements of a pipeline processor in order to increase the amount of processing that can be accomplished per unit time compared to a processor without pipeline processing (Fig. 2 and col. 1, lines 42-67). Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have the output port reservation information receiving sections, allocators, and output port reservation information transmitting sections within each input module simultaneously execute processing for different reservation time slots in order to increase the amount of processing that can be accomplished per unit time compared to a processor without pipeline processing.

Conclusion

11. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. Jordan et al. (USPN 5,805,849) see col. 1, lines 52-67 which pertain to the benefits of pipelined processors. Kumar (USPN 6,122,274) see entire document which pertains to a decentralized pipeline control for a switch.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Daniel J. Ryman whose telephone number is (571)272-3152. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon.-Fri. 7:00-4:30 with every other Friday off.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Huy Vu can be reached on (571)272-3155. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Art Unit: 2665

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

DJR
Daniel J. Ryman
Examiner
Art Unit 2665



HUY D. VU
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2600